REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Michalik (US 5,057,064). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michalik. Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michalik in view of Johnson et al. (US 4,519,596). Claims 2, 9 and 11 were objected to, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 2, and claim 8 that of claim 9. A new claim 14 has been added which is the same as previously allowable claim 11.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/829,620 Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2005

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLO

By:

Cary S. Kappel, Reg. No. 36,561

(signing for William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC 485 Seventh Avenue New York, New York 10018 (212) 736-1940